

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-24 and 26 are now present in the application. Claims 1, 10, 16, 18, 20 and 26 have been amended. Claims 25, 27 and 28 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 16, 20 and 26 are independent. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Response to the Examiner's Advisory Action

The Examiner in his Advisory Action stated that the amendments to claim 1 raise new matter. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to claims 1, 16 and 26 filed on March 14, 2006 contain typographical errors. Those typographical errors have been removed from the instant Amendment. In particular, amended independent claim 1 now recites "a difference between the first driving current and the second driving current being set based on a difference between the first electrical characteristic of the first electro-luminescence diode and the second electrical characteristic of the second electro-luminescence diode"; amended independent claim 16 now recites "a difference between the first ratio and the second ratio being set based on a difference between the first electrical characteristic of the first electro-luminescence diode and the second electrical characteristic of the second electro-luminescence diode"; and amended independent claim 26 recites "a difference between the first ratio and the second ratio being set based on a difference between the first electrical characteristic of the first electro-luminescence diode and the second electrical characteristic of the second electro-luminescence diode." Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit no matter should be raised. Entry of the amendments to the claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Conventional Art disclosed in the present invention (hereinafter “Conventional Art”) in view of Troxell, U.S. Patent No. 5,177,406. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner’s rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

In light of the foregoing amendments to claims, Applicants respectfully submit that this rejection has been obviated and/or rendered moot. While not conceding to the Examiner’s rejection, but merely to expedite prosecution, as the Examiner will note, independent claims 1, 16, 20 and 26 have been amended to address the Examiner’s rejection.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to recite “a difference between the first driving current and the second driving current being set based on a difference between the first electrical characteristic of the first electro-luminescence diode and the second electrical characteristic of the second electro-luminescence diode”.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to recite “a difference between the first ratio and the second ratio being set based on a difference between the first electrical characteristic of the first electro-luminescence diode and the second electrical characteristic of the second electro-luminescence diode”.

Independent claim 20 has been amended to recite “a difference among the different driving currents being set based on a difference among the electrical characteristics of the electro-luminescence diodes”.

Independent claim 26 has been amended to recite “a difference between the first ratio and the second ratio being set based on a difference between the first electrical characteristic of the first electro-luminescence diode and the second electrical characteristic of the second electro-luminescence diode”.

Support for the above combinations of elements and steps as set forth in amended claims 1, 16, 20 and 26 can be found on the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6, beginning on page 5, line 25. Applicants respectfully submit that the above combinations of elements and steps as set forth in amended independent claims 1, 16, 20 and 26 are not disclosed or suggested by the references relied on by the Examiner.

The Conventional Art simply discloses that the driving TFTs for electro-luminescence (EL) diodes with different colors have the same channel width-to-length ratio and the same driving current. Therefore, there is no difference of the currents or the channel width-to-length ratios between two driving TFTs for EL diodes with different colors. Accordingly, the Conventional Art fails to teach that the difference of the currents or the channel width-to-length ratios between two driving TFTs for EL diodes with different colors is set based on the difference between the electrical characteristics of the different EL diodes as recited in amended claims 1, 16, 20 and 26.

Troxell discloses a vacuum fluorescent display (VFD) device, which operates based on a different principle from the electro-luminescence display device and does not include any EL diode. Although Troxell discloses changing the channel width of the driving transistor of the VFD device to provide different channel width-to-length ratios and driving currents, the difference of the currents or the channel width-to-length ratios between two driving transistors is

set based on the *luminous efficiencies of the different color phosphors 16 in the VFD device*. Troxell nowhere teaches that the difference of the currents or the channel width-to-length ratios between two driving transistors is set based on the *electrical characteristics of the EL diodes*. In fact, since Troxell's VFD device does not teaches any EL diode, it cannot teach using the electrical characteristics of the non-existing EL diodes of the electro-luminescence display device to set the difference of the currents or the channel width-to-length ratios between two driving transistors as recited in amended claims 1, 16, 20 and 26.

Accordingly, neither the Conventional art nor Troxell individually or in combination teaches or suggests the above-noted features of amended independent claims 1, 16, 20 and 26. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent claims 1, 16, 20 and 26 and their dependent claims (due to their dependency) clearly define over the teachings of the Conventional art and Troxell. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event there are any matters remaining in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$450.00 is attached herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: May 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

 + 39,538
Esther H. Chong

Registration No.: 40,953

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

